Case	5:15-cv-00703-BRO-SP Document 121 I	Filed 11/10/15 Page 1 of 10 Page ID #:1300
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8		
10		
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	MARGARET KEIPER and DAIL KEIPER, JR., Individually and as the Successors-in-Interest to DAIL KEIPER SR., Deceased, Plaintiffs, vs.  VICTOR VALLEY TRANSIT AUTHORITY, a Governmental entity; DINORAH AGUILAR; TRANSDEV SERVICES, INC., a Maryland Corporation; VEOLIA TRANSPORTATION SERVICES, INC A Corporation; STEVEN KILTY; FBN TRANSPORTATION, LLC, a Wisconsi Limited Liability Company; MARDAN TRANSPORTATION LLC, a Wisconsi Limited Liability Company; AMSTON SUPPLY, INC., a Wisconsin Corporatio and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,  Defendants.	) FIRST AMENDED ANSWER OF ) DEFENDANT, AMSTON SUPPLY, ) INC., TO PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT ) (Answer to Complaint filed 7/6/15, Doc. ) No. 46) ) ) DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL ) (n, ) ) (in ) ) )
27	AND ALL RELATED ACTIONS	_)
		1

5

8 9

11 12

10

14

15

13

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

26 27

28

25

Defendant, AMSTON SUPPLY, INC., ("AMSTON" or "Responding Party"), for itself alone, files its First Amended Answer to the Complaint, by admitting, denying, and alleging as follows:

- Responding Party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 1. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding Party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 2. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding Party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 3. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding Party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 4. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding Party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 5. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding Party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 6. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding Party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 7. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding Party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 8. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding party denies that Defendant Kilty resides in Wisconsin. 9. Responding party admits Kilty was doing business in the County of San Bernardino on the date of the loss complained of by Plaintiffs.
- Responding party admits Defendant FBN is a Wisconsin limited liability 10. company. Responding party admits FBN was doing business in the County of San Bernardino through Defendant Kilty, while Kilty operated under its authority as a motor carrier. Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness of the remaining allegations in this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.

6 7

8

9 10

11 12

14

13

16

17

15

18

19

20

21

22 23

24 25

26

27 28

- 11. Responding party admits Defendant Marden is a Wisconsin limited liability company. Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness of the remaining allegations in this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding party admits Defendant AMSTON is a Wisconsin 12. corporation. Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness of the remaining allegations in this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 13. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding party admits that Defendant Kilty was operating under 15. Defendant FBN's operating authority at the time of this loss. Responding parties denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph.
- Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 16. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 17. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- 18. Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Admit that Defendant Marden was the owner of the tractor involved in 19. this loss.
- Admit that Defendant AMSTON was the owner of the trailer involved in 20. this loss.
  - Deny. 21.
- Responding party admits that Defendant Kilty was operating under 22. Defendant FBN's operating authority at the time of this loss. Responding party

4 5

> 6 7

8 9

11 12

10

13

15

14

16 17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph.

- Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 23. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- 24. Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 25. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 26. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- 27. Responding party admits that Defendant Kilty was operating under Defendant FBN's operating authority at the time of this loss. Responding party denies the remaining allegations in this paragraph.
- 28. Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding party admits the bus struck the tractor trailer combination. 29. Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness of the remaining allegations in this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 30. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
  - 31. Deny.
- 32. Responding party incorporates by this reference its responses to Paragraph numbers 1-31 as though fully set forth herein.
  - 33. Admit.
  - Admit. 34.
  - 35. Deny.
  - 36. Deny.
  - Responding party denies that Defendants FBN, Kilty and/or AMSTON 37.

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

26

27

25

28

were negligent or careless. Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness of the remaining allegations in this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.

- Deny. 38.
- 39. Deny
- Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 40. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
  - 41. Deny.
- Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 42. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
  - 43. Deny.
- Responding party incorporate by this reference their responses to 44. Paragraph numbers 1-31 as though fully set forth herein.
  - 45. Admit.
- Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 46. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
  - Admit. 47.
- Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 48. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 49. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 50. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness 51. of this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- Responding party incorporates by this reference its responses to 52. Paragraph numbers 1-51 as though fully set forth herein.
  - 53. Deny.

54. Deny.

- 55. Deny.
- 56. Responding party denies Kilty violated the *Vehicle Code*. Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness of the remaining allegations in this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- 57. Responding party denies Kilty violated the *Vehicle Code*. Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness of the remaining allegations in this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- 58. Responding party denies Kilty violated the *Vehicle Code*. Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness of the remaining allegations in this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.
- 59. Responding party denies Kilty violated the *Vehicle Code*. Responding party is without sufficient information as to the truthfulness of the remaining allegations in this paragraph and on that basis denies the allegations therein.

# **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

- 60. Plaintiffs' Complaint fails to set forth facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against this Responding party.
- 61. Plaintiffs' Complaint fails to set forth facts sufficient to establish an award for punitive damages against this Responding party.
- 62. That the resulting injuries and death from this loss, if any, were proximately caused and contributed to by the negligence of Plaintiffs' decedent in that he so negligently failed to exercise due care and caution for his own safety.
- 63. That Plaintiffs are barred from recovery against these responding parties and that any damages proven to have been sustained by the Plaintiffs herein, would be the direct and proximate result of the independent negligence and unlawful conduct of independent third parties whether named or not named, or their agents, and not any act or omission on the part of these responding Defendants.

1//

64. Under and pursuant to the terms of California *Civil Code* Section 1413.1 through 1413.5, Plaintiffs are precluded from recovery against these responding Defendants for any non-economic damages except those allocated to Responding party in direct proportion to its fault, if any such fault or damages there be.

### **GRAVES AMENDMENT**

65. The liability of MARDAN is limited and pre-empted under the so-called Graves Amendment as a lessor of vehicles engaged in interstate commerce. 49 U.S.C. 30106, et seq.

Wherefore Responding party prays that Plaintiffs' claims be denied in their entirety and that Responding party be awarded court costs and such other and further relief as the Court may deem appropriate.

DATED: November 10, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAMSON LAW GROUP

By: <u>/s/ John S. Williamson</u>
John S. Williamson
jwilliamson@williamsonlawgroup.net

Attorneys for Defendants, STEVE KILTY; AMSTON SUPPLY, INC., FBN TRANSPORTATION, LLC; MARDAN TRANSPORTATION, LLC

**DEMAND FOR JURY** DEMAND IS HEREBY MADE by Defendant, AMSTON SUPPLY, INC., that the above-captioned action be tried by a jury. DATED: November 10, 2015 Respectfully submitted, WILLIAMSON LAW GROUP By: /s/ John S. Williamson John S. Williamson jwilliamson@williamsonlawgroup.net Attorneys for Defendants, STEVE KILTY; AMSTON SUPPLY, INC., FBN TRANSPORTATION, LLC; MARDAN TRANSPORTATION, LLC 

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on 11/10/15, I electronically transmitted the following document(s) to the Clerk's Office using the CM-ECF System for filing and transmittal of Notice of Electronic filing to the following CM-ECF registrants:

#### **DOCUMENT(S) SERVED:**

FIRST AMENDED ANSWER OF DEFENDANT, AMSTON SUPPLY, INC., TO PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT (Answer to Complaint filed 7/6/15, Doc. No. 46); DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

## **PARTIES SERVED:**

9 | Martin D. Gross

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10 Martin@lawgross.com

LAW OFFICES OF MARTIN D. GROSS

- 11 | 2001 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 205
- 12 | Santa Monica, CA 90403
  - (310) 453-8320/FAX: (310) 861-1359
- ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS, MARGARET KIEPER AND DAIL KIEPER,
  JR., INDIVIDUALLY AND AS THE SUCCESSORS-IN-INTEREST TO DAIL
  KEIPER, SR., DECEASED
- 16 Douglas F. Welebir
- 17 dfw@wtw-law.com
  - WELEBIR TIERNEY & WECK
- 18 2068 Orange Tree Lane, Suite 215
- Redlands, CA 92374
  - (909) 335-0444/FAX: (909) 335-0452
- 20 ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS, MICHAEL CHESTNUT, MISIONA 21 TUSIESEINA, PEDRO MIRANDA
- 22 Kevin L. Elder
- 23 <u>kelder@penneyandassociates.com</u>
  - PENNEY & ASSOCIATES
- 6536 Lonetree Blvd.
- <sup>25</sup> Rocklin, CA 95765
- <sub>26</sub> || (916) 786-7662 / (916) 786-0144
- ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS, JESUS AGUILAR, NAIOMI BRIDGETTE,
- JERMAINE RATLIFF, a minor, by and through his Guardian ad Litem,
  NAIOMI BRIDGETTE

Case	5:15-cv-00703-BRO-SP Document 121 Filed 11/10/15 Page 10 of 10 Page ID #:1309
1	Marisa Rodriguez-Shapoval
2	mrodriguez-shapoval@wwhgd.com WEINBERG, WHEELER, HUDGINS, GUNN & DIAL, LLC
3	6385 S. Rainbow Blvd., Suite 400
3	Los Vegas, NV 89118
4	(702) 938-3838/FAX: (702) 938-3864
5	ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS, VICTOR VALLEY TRANSIT
6	AUTHORITY, TRANSDEV SERVICES, INC., VEOLIA TRANSPORTATION
2700	SERVICES, INC., DINORAH AGUILAR
7	Lanatta E. Lamah
8	Loretta E. Lynch Attorney General of the United States
9	Laura E. Duffy
	United States Attorney
10	Katherine L. Parker
11	katherine.parker@usdoj.gov
12	Glen F. Dorgan
12	glen.dorgan@usdoj.gov
13	Valerie E. Torres
14	valerie.torres@usdoj.gov
15	Special Attorneys to the Attorney General
16	Office of the U.S. Attorney 880 Front Street, Room 6293
	San Diego, Ca 92101
17	(619) 546-7665 / (619) 546-7751
18	Glen.dorgan@usdoj.gov
19	ATTORNEYS FOR THIRD-PARTY DEFENDANT UNITED STATES OF
	AMERICA
20	
21	
22	/s/ Brenda Rowland
22	BRENDA ROWLAND
23	
24	
25	
26	
26	
27	
28	